

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**

---



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,071	05/22/2001	Kazuaki Sugai	CANO:027	7600

7590 08/16/2004

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES  
P.O. Box 826  
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/863,071

**Applicant(s)**

SUGAI, KAZUAKI

**Examiner**

Sindya Narayanaswamy

**Art Unit**

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11 and 13-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11 and 13-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-36 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Brooks, US-6,008,809 in view of Matsumoto et al. (hereinafter Matsumoto), US-6,614,439.

4. As per claim 1, Brooks teaches the multi-window display system comprising: a plurality of window display sections that each display data; a selecting section that selects one of the window display sections; changes sizes of the window display sections based on an order of selection by the selecting section (*window is selected and dragged into dynamic window, window is dynamically sized, window can be altered in horizontal and vertical boundary*) (col. 2, lines 11-51).

Art Unit: 2174

Brooks does not specifically teach a storage for selection history information for each of the window display sections selected by the selecting section; and a control section that is responsive to selection of one of the window display sections by the selecting section. However, Matsumoto teaches a storage for selection history information for each of the window display sections selected by the selecting section; and a control section that is responsive to selection of one of the window display sections by the selecting section (*priority history information updated after window selections are made*) (col. 11, line 55-col. 12, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brooks with Matsumoto's method of storing selection history in order to create a system more fully catered towards the preferences and needs of the user.

5. As per claim 2, Brooks teaches a multi-window display system wherein the control section determines display positions and sizes of the wide window display sections and the operation panel display sections such that the selected one of the window display sections does not overlap with any of the window display sections other than the selected one of the window display sections or any of the operation panel window display sections (*no overlapping, horizontal and vertical adjustments*) (Abstract, lines 17-27, col. 2, lines 36-47).

6. As per claim 3, Brooks teaches the multi-window display system wherein the control section determines a display position and size of the window sections other than

Art Unit: 2174

the selected one of the window display sections based on a display position and size of the selected one of the window display sections (*selecting process relates windows*) (col. 2, lines 34-47).

7. As per claim 4, Brooks teaches the multi-window display system further comprising a storage device that stores an order of display precedence for and a history of selection of the window display sections (*mass storage interface*) (col. 3, lines 51-54).

8. As per claim 5, Brooks teaches a multi-window display system comprising: a plurality of window display sections that each display data; a plurality of operation panel window display sections that display a plurality of operation panel windows having operating buttons for operating the window display sections; a selecting section that selects one of the window display sections; a storage that stores position information for each of the plurality of operation panel windows; and a control section that changes a size of one of the operation panel window display sections corresponding to the selected one of the window display sections and calculates a display position of the corresponding operation panel window display section in accordance with a changing of a size of the selected one of the window display sections, and the position information stored in the storage; and a display control section that displays the size-changed operation panel window display section based on the calculated display position (*method for viewing multiple windows, dynamic window acts as tool for user to display multiple windows, selection process allows user to relate windows, control section (allows alteration/manipulation of windows)*) (col. 2, lines 11-52).

9. As per claim 6, Brooks teaches a multi-window display system wherein the control section changes sizes of the operating buttons of the operation panel window display sections in accordance with the changing of the size of the selected one the window display sections (*buttons created as necessary, based on sizes of windows and space availability*) (col. 11, lines 36-49).

10. As per claim 7, Brooks teaches the multi-window display system wherein the control section changes number of the operating buttons of the operation panel window display section in accordance with the changing of the size of the selected on of the window display sections (col. 11, lines 36-49).

11. As per claims 8 and 16, Brooks and Matsumoto do not teach the method, as in claim 5, of the multi-window display system wherein the control section changes display positions and sizes of all of the window display sections and the operation panel window display sections that are being displayed, in accordance with the changing of the size of the selected one of the window display sections. However Official Notice is taken that the manipulation of control and operation panel windows/buttons are well known in the art therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a method by which the control section and operation panel windows could be changed in order to allow the user greater flexibility in selected a desired display.

Art Unit: 2174

12. As per claims 9-12, they are similar in scope to claims 1-4 and are rejected on the same basis.

13. As per claims 13-15, they are similar in scope to claims 5-7 and are rejected on the same basis.

14. As per claim 17, it is similar in scope to claim 1 and is rejected on the same basis.

15. As per claim 18, it is similar in scope to claim 18 and is rejected on the same basis.

16. As per claim 19, Brooks teaches the multi-window display system comprising: a plurality of window display sections that each display data; operation panel window display sections that display operation panel windows for operating the window display sections; a selecting section that selects one of the window display sections and displaying the selected one of the window display sections (*dragged in a path...as a leftward horizontal path*) (col. 2, lines 34-57, col. 10, lines 42-48).

Brooks does not specifically teach the system with an indicating section that indicates a direction of movement of the one of the window display sections selected by the selecting section; or a control section that is responsive to indication of the direction of movement of the selected one of the window display sections by the movement direction indicating section, for moving the selected one of the window display sections in the indicated direction of movement, or the displaying of a an enlarged display section upon selection. However, Matsumoto teaches the system with an indicating section that indicates a direction of movement of the one of the window display sections selected by the selecting section; and a control section that is responsive to indication of the direction



Art Unit: 2174

of movement of the selected one of the window display sections by the movement direction indicating section, for moving the selected one of the window display sections in the indicated direction of movement (*the size of the display position and the size of the display window that is changed by the enlargement action are altered*) and an enlarged display upon selection (*window resolution (enlargement) action*) (Fig. 10; col. 11, line 55-col. 12, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brooks with Matsumoto's method of window display manipulation in order to create a windowing system with additional beneficial capabilities for the user.

17. As per claim 20, Brooks teaches a multi-window display system wherein when one of the window display sections has been selected by the selecting section, the control section carries out control such that at least one of the window display sections other than one of the window display sections selected by the selecting section are displayed so as not to overlap with the window display section selected by the selecting section the enlarged size being larger in size than sizes of non-selected ones of the window display sections (col. 5, lines 42-46).

18. As per claim 21, Brooks teaches the multi-window display system wherein when one of the window display sections has been selected by the selecting section that the control section displays one of the window display sections selected by the selecting section at an enlarged size (*user can selectively adjust/enlarge sizes*) (col. 5, lines 55-67).

19. As per claim 22, Brooks teaches the multi-window display system wherein when one of the window display sections displayed at the enlarged size is moved in the indicated direction of movement, the control section displays one of the window display sections displayed at the enlarged size at maximum size (*reduced to button size or enlarged to maximum size*) (col. 12, lines 22-39).

20. As per claim 23, Brooks teaches a multi-window display system as claimed, further comprising a plurality of operation panel window display sections that display operation panel windows for operating the window display sections and wherein when one of the window display sections displayed at the enlarged size is moved in the indicated direction of movement, the control section displays the operation panel window display sections in a region not occupied by the window display sections (col. 14, lines 27-42).

21. As per claim 24, Brooks teaches a multi-window display system comprising a plurality of window display sections that each display data; an operation panel window for display sections, each of the window display sections being displayed in a state separated from each other; a selecting section that selects one of the window display sections or one of the operation panel window display sections; and a control section that is responsive to selection of one of a window display sections by the selecting section in a different display mode from a display mode in which the selected window display section is displayed (col. 2, lines 34-57).

Brooks and Matsumoto do not specifically teach the system in which each window has a separate operation panel. However, Official Notice is taken that windows with separate operating panels within a single display are well known in the art therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Brooks and Matsumoto to include separate operating panels for each window to allow for each window to be controlled and operated in a required and desired manner specific to the window.

22. As per claims 25 and 26, Brooks and Matsumoto do not specifically teach a multi-window display system wherein when another one of the operation panel window display sections has been selected by the selecting section following selection of one of the operation panel window display sections the control sections changes the display of one of the operation panel window display sections corresponding to another one of the window display sections from semi-transparent display to non-transparent display or displays the selected one of the operation panel window display sections non-transparently. However, Official Notice is taken that a non-transparent display is well known in the art, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to switch a semi-transparent display to a non-transparent one when it is not necessary for the user (i.e. no overlap exists).

23. As per claims 27-31, they are similar in scope to claims 19-23 and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

Art Unit: 2174

24. As per claims 32-34, they are the similar in scope to claims 24-26 and are rejected on the same basis.

*The applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new rejection.*

**Conclusion**

KK  
6/10/04

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. US 6426761 – Kanevsky et al. – resizable windowing system

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sindya Narayanaswamy whose telephone number is (703) 305-8473. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sindya Narayanaswamy  
July 15, 2004

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100